

Comments on IG Report

p 143 Paragraph 2 - Indicate that consultants are contemporary, that their academic approach works in applied settings. STATINTL  
 Disregards our response and [REDACTED] report.

p 144. Paragraph 2 - Implication that lack of a consistent policy Agency-wide is inappropriate does not include awareness that testing is appropriate for some jobs, not so for others.

Paragraph 2 - We write reports focussing on specific jobs and have no control over whether or not report is in file as it is shopped for other positions.

p145. 1<sup>st</sup> Paragraph - Again, the implication that PATB is not used by all managers/ components is inappropriate. What the hell is the complaint?

p145 Paragraph 2 - Agree! There should be a uniform policy; PSS can't implement it.

p 145, paragraph 2 - response that decisions by individual managers results in "high potential...." The PATB is no more likely to be used in disparate treatment than are file reviews, interview results, etc.

p 147, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: We have provided reliability data, which they chose to ignore.

3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph: We do not score the writing sample - a point beyond the I G's comprehension.

3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph - Total disregard of fact that Agency populations, until last few years, have included virtually no blacks or females - a point we made in our response.

p 149, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: Split-half may yield spuriously high results, but is only technique feasible. Reliability is not the issue.

(3)

p150 Paragraph 2 - Totally disregards the fact that studies were completed for Agency consumers, not for [REDACTED] a point made previously. STATINTL

p151 - Implication that PSS is at fault for small sample size; no awareness that we were dealing with entire population. If the consultants understood more about the Agency, its numbers of people, range of jobs, etc., this point should not have been raised.

p151, last paragraph: PSS does not have the charter for developing criteria measures. We encourage components to develop such measures, but typically have to accept whatever measure is already being used. To my knowledge, we have not used Fitness Report ratings as criteria.

p152: Arguments have been made previously. What the hell do they mean by "validity data" for writing sample? Refer to [REDACTED] report re the SCIT. STATINTL

Managers do find information re an applicant's career interests in which certain professionals to be of use.

Additionally, we typically report job clusters (re interests) not merely the listing of professionals in similar interests.

P 152 : IG seems to have missed the point that we use Bio information in a clinical sense, to let us get a better feel for the individual than can be derived simply from scores on interests, abilities, work attitudes, etc.

STATINTL

P 153, paragraph 2 : Refer to [REDACTED] report, which states that our reports seem, if anything, overly-cautious.

P 153, last paragraph : Refer to PSS response to IG report re type of job analysis which is appropriate.

Approved For Release 2002/01/25 : CIA-RDP00-01458R000100130013-4

P 154, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: I G missed the point -

PSS must be invited in by a component. We do not have the charter for initiating validity studies.

P 154, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: How do the consultants reach conclusion that "there is no logical, professionally justifiable relationship... between PATB and jobs for which it used as a selection test?"

P 154, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: Training performance can be used as a criterion in the absence of more preferred criterion measures.

P 155, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph: Refer to recent literature in applied fields.

P 155, last paragraph: Refer to PSS response to 1<sup>st</sup> I G draft; we do need the resources and should not be held responsible for lack thereof.

P 156: Recommendations: There are better techniques than PAQ: I G is not qualified to recommend which technique should be used.

p 158

~~Narrative Report~~

See PSS response plus [REDACTED]  
report. I particularly object to statement  
that "the narrative reports based on the  
test scores are misleading and potentially  
impair"

Remainder of report: All three points were  
covered by PSS response.